

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed March 12, 2002. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-20 were pending in this patent application. The Examiner rejected Claims 1-20. Thus, Claims 1-20 are now pending in the Application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant is resubmitting the previously undated references which the Examiner refused to consider with date information. Applicant respectfully requests consideration of these references.

Section 103 Rejection

Claims 1, 2, 17, 18 and 20 stand rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Colgan, U.S. Patent No. 5,510,978 ("Colgan"), in view of Brown, U.S. Patent No. 6,173,284 ("Brown"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and the assertions and determinations therein.

Neither Colgan nor Brown, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest every element of Claims 1, 17 and 20. Claim 1 recites, in part, "receiving an alert at a clearing house", "handling a public safety event based on the alert" and "generating a notification in response to a subscriber profile and the event". The Examiner relies solely on Brown to teach these elements and admits that Colgan does not teach these elements. Office Action, p. 2. The Examiner has not shown how Brown teaches or suggests these elements of Claim 1 and Brown does not teach or suggest these elements. Instead, the Examiner has merely made a conclusory statement the Brown teaches these elements and provides no explanation how the cited portions of Brown teach or suggest particular elements of Claim 1. For example, no teaching or suggestion of "a clearing house", "a subscriber profile" or "handling a public safety event based on the alert" is provided in any of the cited portions of Brown, nor has the Examiner shown how these elements of Claim 1 are taught or suggested by Brown. Claim 1 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Claim 17 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above, in addition, Claim 17 recites, in part, "generating an alert from a mobile device associated with a law enforcement vehicle". The Examiner relies on Colgan to teach these elements of Claim 17. Office Action, p.

2. Colgan does not teach or suggest "a law enforcement vehicle", nor has the Examiner shown where Colgan teaches this element of Claim 17.

Independent Claims 1 and 17 are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Independent Claim 20 is also allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that Claims 1, 17 and 20 be allowed.

Dependent Claim 2 recites, in part, "the event comprises a type indication, a location indication, a time indication, a date indication, an access level and event details." Brown does not teach or suggest an "access level". The cited portion of Brown appears to involve a password and username associated with a police officer used to log-on to a web based interface. Brown, col. 7, lines 7-30. The mere existence of a username and password does not teach or suggest an "access level" associated with an "event" because the username and password are associated with the police officer instead of the event. In addition, the username and password of Brown appear to only generally control access to the database as a whole, as opposed to the event. *Id.* Colgan is not relied upon to teach these elements of Claim 2, nor does Colgan teach or suggest these elements. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Claim 2 is patentable over the cited patents. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that Claim 2 be allowed.

Claims 3-5 and 19 stand rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colgan-Brown, and further in view of Langsenkamp et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,912,947 ("Langsenkamp"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and the assertions and determinations therein.

No motivation exists to combine Colgan-Brown with Langsenkamp. The Examiner has merely made a conclusory statement that Colgan-Brown is combinable with Langsenkamp without providing any motivation in either Colgan-Brown or Langsenkamp, or the knowledge available in the art, for the proposed combination. See MPEP 2143. Langsenkamp appears to generally involve phone numbers and geographic information associated with the phone numbers. Langsenkamp, Abstract. Colgan-Brown appear to generally involve database searching. See Brown, col. 2, lines 11-35. One skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine these references because phone number based geographic information and database searching are unrelated. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 3-5 and 19 based on the improper combination of Colgan-Brown with Langsenkamp.

Dependent Claims 3-5 depend from independent Claim 1 and dependent Claim 19 depends from independent Claim 17. Claims 1 and 17 are shown above to be allowable. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 3-5 and 19 as dependent from an allowable base claim and as defining further distinctions over the cited patents, either alone, or in a proper combination.

Claims 6-16 stand rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colgan-Brown-Langsenkamp, and further in view of Hunt et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,893,091 ("Hunt"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and the assertions and determinations therein.

Claim 8 recites, in part, "wherein comparing the information need comprises determining whether the subscriber is allowed to access the event." Brown is relied upon by the Examiner to teach these elements of Claim 8. The Examiner has not relied on Colgan, Hunt or Langsenkamp to teach or suggest these elements, nor do Colgan, Hunt or Langsenkamp, either alone or in a proper combination, teach or suggest these elements. See Office Action, p. 5. The mere existence of a username and password for a police officer, as described in Brown, only determines whether the police officer can access the database as a whole, not "whether the subscriber is allowed to access the *event* [emphasis added]". See Brown, col. 7, lines 7-30. For at least these reasons, Claim 8 is allowable over Colgan- Brown-Langsenkamp-Hunt, either alone or in a proper combination.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has provided no motivation to combine Colgan-Brown-Langsenkamp with Hunt beyond conclusory statements that "it would have been obvious" and that networked notification systems are an analogous field, nor does such a motivation exist. As noted above, some motivation must be found in the references themselves or the knowledge available to one in the art for the proposed combination. See MPEP 2143.

Dependent Claims 6-16 depend from independent Claim 1, shown above to be allowable. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Claims 6-16 are allowable over Colgan-Brown-Langsenkamp-Hunt as depending from an allowable base claim and as including further distinctions over the cited patents, either alone, or in a proper combination.


CONCLUSION

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-20.

Although Applicant believes that no other fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

If there are matters that can be discussed by telephone to further the prosecution of this application, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner call its attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicant



Matthew B. Talpis
Reg. No. 45,152

Correspondence Address:
Matthew B. Talpis, Esq.
Baker Botts L.L.P.
2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600
Dallas, Texas 75201-2980
Phone: 214-953-6984
Fax: 214-661-4984

Date: 6-3-02